

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-10 and 12-26 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Donovan et al. (U.S. Patent 1,888,851). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner indicated that claims 11 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has now been rewritten to include the limitations of claims 10 and 11 and thus is considered to be allowable. New claim 18 has been submitted which includes limitations of claims 1, 14 and 15. Accordingly, this claim is also considered to be allowable. Since these are the only independent claims remaining, Applicants submit that these claims as well as dependent claims 2-10, 14-17 and 19-26 are also allowable.

It is noted that the Examiner previously required an Election of Species. This was a four way election with one embodiment being

chosen in each of four areas. It was recognized that claim 1 was originally generic. Claim 1 now includes the limitations which limit it to the arrangement of Fig. 4 in the third area. Claim 18 is limited to the embodiment shown in Fig. 6b in the fourth area. Although these two claims are now limited to a single embodiment in one of the four areas, this means that they are still generic to all of the embodiments in the other three areas. Accordingly, it is proper for these independent claims to now have depend therefrom all of the claims in the other areas since these independent claims would be generic to the dependent claims of the other areas.

More specifically, claim 1 includes the limitations of claims 10 and 11 which limits it to the embodiment of Fig. 4 in the third area and excludes the embodiment of Fig. 5 which is described in claim 12. However, this would mean that it is generic to all four embodiments of the first area found in Fig. 2. and thus all of claims 2-9 are properly dependent therefrom. Likewise, the four embodiments of the fourth area found in Fig. 6 and described in claims 13-17 also properly depend therefrom.

In regard to new claim 18, it is limited to the embodiment of Fig. 6b in the fourth area and thus must exclude the embodiments in Figs. 6a, 6c, and 6d. However, it is still generic to all the embodiments in the first area of Fig. 2, including claims 2-9 and

all of the embodiments in the third area of Figs. 4 and 5. Thus, claims 19-26 which duplicate claims 2-9 now depend from claim 18. Likewise, claims 10 and 12 also depend from claim 18.

Claim 11 has been canceled since the combination of original claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 15 would be included in dependent claim 15 and should not be duplicated by having claim 11 depend through claim 10 from claim 18 which includes the limitations of claims 1, 14 and 15. In view of this, Applicants submit that all of these dependent claims which have been previously withdrawn due to the Election of Species should now be returned in the fashion presented in this amendment. It is further noted that Applicants reserve the right to file additional divisional applications for the remaining species not covered by the current claims.

#### **Filed Papers**

In Section 5 of the Action, the Examiner questioned whether a Declaration and an Information Disclosure Statement were filed on March 22, 2002, since the file jacket indicated this, but that no papers were found in the file. Applicants' records do not indicate that papers were filed on this date. The Declaration and Information Disclosure Statement were filed on December 14, 2001 with the original application.

Appl. No. 10/014,490  
Amendment filed  
Office Action dated January 20, 2004

Docket No.: 3313-0445P  
Group Art: 3651  
Page 14 of 14

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims are now allowable as indicated by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By



Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

for

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

#43,368

KM/RFG/ndb/slb  
3313-0445P